Earned Wealth, Engaged Bidders? Evidence from a second price auction

Nicolas Jacquemet, Stephane Luchini, Robert-Vincent Joule, Jason Shogren

GREQAM

Groupement de Recherche en Economie
Quantitative d'Aix-Marseille - UMR-CNRS 6579
Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales
Universités d'Aix-Marseille II et III

Document de Travail
n°2008-13

EARNED WEALTH, ENGAGED BIDDERS? EVIDENCE FROM A SECOND PRICE AUCTION

Nicolas JACQUEMET
Robert-Vincent JOULE
Stéphane LUCHINI
Jason SHOGREN

April 2008



Earned Wealth, Engaged Bidders? Evidence from a second price auction *

Nicolas Jacquemet[†] Robert-Vincent Joule[‡] Stéphane Luchini[§] Jason Shogren[¶]

April 2008

Abstract

Recent work in experimental economics has explored whether observed behavior depends on whether wealth was windfall or earned. This paper extends this work by considering whether earned wealth affects bidding behavior in an induced-value second-price auction. We find people bid more sincerely in the auction with earned wealth given monetary incentives; earned wealth did not induce sincere bidding in hypothetical auctions.

Keywords: Auctions; Demand revelation; Experimental valuation; Hypothetical bias; Earned Money.

JEL Classification: C3, D1.

1 Introduction

There has been a push in experimental economics to replace windfall wealth with earned wealth. Legitimize wealth with effort has been shown to affect people's behavior in experiments, especially in games involving social preferences (i.e., self-interested people who also think about the payoffs and intentions of others). For example, people who earned their wealth were less generous in games that involve resource sharing, e.g., the dictator game.Evidence suggests people are less generous and less prone to take risks when spending their own money (see Thaler and Johnson, 1990; Cherry, Frykblom, and Shogren, 2002;

*We thank Maxim Frolov for his assistance in developing the software and Bruno Rock for his help in running the experiment. Financial support of French Research Ministry (n 04 5 666 ACI Santé et Environnement) is gratefully acknowledged. Logistical help from the Paris School of Economics was greatly appreciated.

[†]Paris School of Economics and University of Paris I Panthéon–Sorbonne. Centre d'Economie de la Sorbonne, 106 Bd. de l'Hôpital, 75013 Paris. Nicolas.Jacquemet@univ-paris1.fr

[‡]Laboratoire de Psychologie Sociale - EA 849, Université de Provence, 29, avenue Robert-Schuman 13621 Aix-en-Provence cedex 1. joule-rv@up.univ-aix.fr

[§]GREQAM-CNRS, Centre de la Vieille Charité, 13236 Marseille Cedex 02. stephane.luchini@univmed.fr

[¶]Department of Economics and Finance, University of Wyoming, Laramie, WY 82071-3985, United States; and Department of Economics, Umeå University, S 901 87 Umeå, Sweden. JRamses@uwyo.edu

Cherry, Kroll, and Shogren, 2005).[1] The open question is whether earned wealth helps concentrate the mind on "being more rational" or whether it simply reduces one's social preferences or both.

Herein we explore this question by examining whether earned wealth will affect bidding behavior in Vickrey (1961)'s classic demand-revealing second price auction. The second price auction is a good case study on the origins of wealth because earlier experiments have observed risk taking and insincere bidding behavior given windfall wealth (see the review by Kagel, 1995). Also the auction provides a cleaner environment since it involves only private values; there is no mechanism to share wealth, which eliminates social preferences from the story since a bidders' behavior is independent of the distribution and behavior of the other players.

Our results suggest earned money matters in the auction mechanism, and in a particular way. Bidding behavior was more demand-revealing and efficiency was significantly greater for earned wealth relative to windfall treatments. But this only held when monetary incentives also existed; earned wealth had the opposite effect on bidding behavior when the auction was non-binding.

2 The experiment

We use a 2×2 factorial design that focuses on two factors that affect the external validity of experimental decisions: earned versus windfall wealth and monetary versus hypothetical bidding in a second-price auctionVickrey is the classic demand revealing auction to use in an experiment given it is straightforward to explain, the weakly dominant strategy is to bid one's value, and the price is endogenously determined by the bidders (Kagel, 1995). In all treatments in each period, one unit of an unspecified "good" is sold on the auction. Exchange rules of the second-price auction are: the highest bidder wins and pays the second-highest bidder's bid. An auction has 9 bidders each endowed with a unique induced value – *i.e.* the price at which the bidder can sell the good to the monitor after the auction.

The induced demand curve is identical in all auctions and is defined by: $\{84; 76; 71; 68; 65; 63; 53; 38; 24\}$. All monetary values are expressed in ECU (*Experimental Currency Unit*). The auction is repeated over 9 periods, implementing all possible permutations between individual private values. Each bidder experiences each private value once; and the entire demand curve is induced in every period.[2] Bidders do not know the other bidders' induced value or the induced demand curve. A bidding period ends when every bidder has chosen a bid between 0 and 100. At the end of the period, each bidder is privately informed about whether he or she won the auction (and the market clearing price if they won), their gain for the period and whether a new auction round is about to start.

All four treatments followed the same design expect for the origin of the wealth and the consequences of bidding. First, the **windfall-hypothetical** treatment (labeled WH) is our baseline. The windfall wealth is a show-up fee of 10€. Second, in the **Monetary incentives only** treatment (WM), bidding is now binding: auction earnings are translated into Euros given a common knowledge exchange rate

[1] In contrast, some researchers find evidence that the origin of assets does not influence subject behavior in laboratory settings (e.g. Clark, 1998, 2002; Rutström and Williams, 2000). But see Harrison (2007) for an alternative interpretation of Clark's (2002) data.

[2] Although the repetition is deterministic, we avoid end-game effect by providing the subjects with no information on that point – except for the repetition itself.

(3 ECU for 1 €).[3] In each round, the winning bidder's profits equal the difference between his or her induced value and the market price he or she pays for the good (the second highest bid). Profits of the 8 non-winning bidders are zero.Only the winner sees the two highest bids at the end of the round. Overall earnings of the subjects are computed as the sum of the resulting amount and the 10€ show-up fee.

Third, we create the earned-wealth only treatment by adding an intermediate step to the baseline. Following Cherry, Frykblom, and Shogren (2002); Cherry, Kroll, and Shogren (2005), in **earned wealth-only** (EH) subjects earned their wealth by answering 20 questions of general interest. Each question is presented sequentially, and each question has four possible answers among which one is correct. Monetary earnings are proportional to correct answers. We selected the questions from the sheets used by the French government to select some of its civil servants. This seems well suited to discriminate between undergraduate students, since participation to the selection process is open only to holders of the French baccalaureate. [4] Subjects learn their score and total earnings at the end ECU of this stage. The payment rate is 2 ECU *per* correct answer (the exchange rate is again 3 ECU for 1 €). Once all subjects answer all questions, the Vickrey auction begins.

The final treatment combines **Monetary incentives with earned wealth** (EM). Bidding behavior is now binding. The four experimental sessions were run in Paris, each involving 18 subjects.[5] In each session, subjects are separated into two distinct 9-bidder auctions, which provides two sessions for each treatment. Participants were first to third-year undergraduate students in law, economics or chemistry. The experiment was computerized using a software developed under REGATE (Zeiliger, 2000).

3 Results

We consider four indicators of sincere bidding behavior across the four treatments – aggregate bidding and demand, individual bidding behavior, allocative efficient, and surplus extracted.

First, we consider aggregate bidding behavior. Table 1 illustrates bidding behavior at the aggregate level by induced value and treatment. We add up the bids and sort by induced value for each of the treatments.

Under windfall wealth, we observe similar bidding behavior with and without monetary incentives, e.g., no hypothetical bias in bidding. Strictly rational bidding in the monetary and hypothetical treatments would result in the elicitation of 9756 ECU $= 542 \times 18$. Adding up the bids for each induced value, we see people tend to overbid, both with and without monetary incentives, 10328 ECU(105.9% of the total demand) and 10134 ECU (103.9%). Unconditional mean test shows that bidding behavior with or without monetary incentives are not significantly different ($p = 0.645$).

A different story emerges for the earned wealth treatments. Our results suggest significant difference in bidding behavior with and without monetary incentives. Elicited demand reveals underbidding,

[3] Negative total earnings would decrease the show up fee up to 5€. This lower bound stems from the way participants are recruited: we contractually commit ourselves to a minimum earning equal to 5€.

[4] The procedure is labeled *Concours de Catégorie B de la fonction publique*. Our source is `http://pagesperso-orange.fr/bac-es/qcm/annales_c02_r01.html`.

[5] The two windfall sessions are taken from the original experimental plan of Jacquemet, Joule, Luchini, and Shogren (2008a). The two earned money sessions are the first two parts of a longer experiment described in Jacquemet, Joule, Luchini, and Shogren (2008b).

Table 1: Aggregate bidding behavior by group and induced value

Induced value	24	38	53	63	65	68	71	76	84	All
Ag. Demand (AD)	432	684	954	1134	1170	1224	1278	1368	1512	9756
Winfall wealth & Hypothetical										
Revealed AD	626.0	808.0	1050.0	1193.0	1201.0	1192.0	1242.0	1290.0	1532.0	10134
Ratio RAD/AD	144.9%	118.1%	110.1%	105.2%	102.6%	97.4%	97.2%	94.3%	101.3%	103.9%
Monetary incentives only										
Revealed AD	687.0	735.0	1078.0	1045.0	1318.0	1259.0	1281.0	1334.0	1591.0	10328
Ratio RAD/AD	159.0%	107.5%	113.0%	92.2%	112.6%	102.9%	100.2%	97.5%	105.2%	105.9%
Earned wealth only										
Revealed AD	670.0	746.0	1045.0	1215.0	1205.0	1348.0	1334.0	1453.0	1479.0	10495
Ratio RAD/AD	155.1%	109.1%	109.5%	107.1%	103.0%	110.1%	104.4%	106.2%	97.8%	107.6%
Earned wealth & Monetary incentive										
Revealed AD	492.0	678.0	816.0	1145.0	1121.0	1229.0	1260.0	1406.0	1490.0	9637
Ratio RAD/AD	113.9%	99.1%	85.5%	101.0%	95.8%	100.4%	98.6%	102.8%	98.5%	98.8%

Note. The first row reports the induced values attributed to buyers. The second row reports the corresponding aggregate demand in each treatment, *i.e.* induced values $\times$ number of subjects. For each treatment (four remaining rows), the upper part of the row displays the aggregate revealed demand (*i.e.* the observed bids posted by buyers the induced value of whom are reported in column). The bottom part reports the ratio of this revealed demand to the aggregate induced demand, in %.

9637 ECU (98.8%), with monetary incentives; and overbidding at 10495 (107.6%) without monetary incentives. The difference in demand is statistically significant, p-value $p = .046$ (unconditional mean test).

Consider now each induced value in Table 1: it suggests bidding behavior under earned wealth with monetary incentives performed relatively well at revealing demand in the aggregate. Results show elicited demand matched the induced demand for all the induced values. Sincere bidding on aggregate was similar for the other three treatments, except for the off-margin lowest induced value (24 ECU) in which bids were more likely to exceed induced demand.

Second, we now examine the rationality assumption of perfect demand revealing bids. If each bidder maximizes his or her private payoff, each bid should equal the induced value. In WH, 16.7% of bids are perfectly revealing; 46.9% of bids were within a 10 percent interval of the induced value ($\nu \pm 0.1\nu$). Insincere bidders both inflated and shave bids: 29.6% and 23.5%. Under WM, 5.5% of the bids are perfectly revealing and 52.5% are in the 10 percent interval. Bidders tended to inflate their bids (33.3%) rather than shaving them (14.2%).

Under EM, 8.7% of the bidders bid sincerely and 43.8% were bidding within the 10 percent interval. Here again, insincere bidders inflated their bids (38.9%) rather than shaved their bids (17.3%). Under EM, 20.4% of bidders gave their induced value and 63.6% bided within the 10 percent interval. Bidders equally inflated and shaved their bids: 18.5% and 17.9%.

We test the assumption of perfect revealing bids by computing the ratio between the bid and the induced value for each bidder. Rational sincere bidding implies a ratio of one, which is tested by an equality test on the estimated intercept of the regression on a constant. We cannot reject the null of rational bidding behavior for EM ($p = 0.812$); in all other treatments, we do reject the null:

WH($p = 0.034$), WM ($p = 0.039$), and WH ($p = 0.010$). On average, earned money increased the likelihood that a bidder would bid sincerely but only with monetary incentives in place; it had the opposite effect when bids were not binding.

Third, now consider allocative efficiency–a second criterion of a well functioning auction. The auction should allocate the good to the person who values it the most and he or she should pay the second highest bid. We see the highest value bidder (with induced value of 84 ECU) won the auction the most frequently in EM: 61.1% of the auctions. This was greater than the other three treatments: WH, 44.4% ($p = .504$); WM, 50.0% ($p = .774$); and EH, 22.2% ($p = .043$).

Strict efficiency implies the winner pays the second highest induced value. No treatment was particularly successful in this level of precision: 0% for both windfall wealth treatments; 5.5% for earned wealth treatments. A weaker test is if the winner pays a price within the 10 percent interval around this value.Here, EM now performs significantly better than the other treatments: 72.2% of all exchanges. This compares to 27.8% for WH ($p = .020$), 33.3% for WM ($p = .045$) and 38.9% for EH ($p = .094$).

Finally, we examine average surplus extracted by bidders.A rational bidder would extract 8 ECU after 9 periods (84ECU - 76ECU). Again EMperformed significantly better than the other treatments: the average bidders broke about even with a surplus of -0.3ECU. The other treatments all resulted in a substantial negative surplus significantly different from that in EM: -13.4ECU for EH ($p = .073$), -14.3ECU for WM ($p = 0.04$), and -23.4 for EH($p = 0.004$).

Overall, based on our four indicators of sincere auction bidding, the most effective treatment was with earned wealth and monetary incentives–the auction environment closest to the wilds. Earning money and spending it for real seemed to concentrate the mind on the task at hand, which in our case was bidding one's induced value in the second-price auction.

4 Concluding remarks

As noted by Bellman nearly fifty years ago: "in the physical world, in connection with testing and experimentation, it is often useful to conceive of nature, in some vague anthropomorphic fashion, as an opponent attempting to conceal the truth from us. The design of experiments may be conceived of as a game in which we attempt to extract information from a stubborn, but fair, opponent" (Bellman, 1957, p.283). Herein we find that earned wealth matters in our experimental private value second-price auction. Earned wealth with monetary incentives induced more sincere bidding and greater efficiency relative to the classic windfall wealth treatment; and relative to the hypothetical bidding employed in stated preference valuation surveys. Since our design did not allow social preferences to play a role in behavior, earned wealth seemed to help concentrate the mind on the task at hand–rational bidding.

References

Bellman, R. (1957): *Dynamic Programming*. Princeton University Press, Princeton: New Jersey.

Cherry, T. L., P. Frykblom, and J. F. Shogren (2002): "Hardnose the Dictator," *American Economic Review*, 92(4), 1218–1221.

Cherry, T. L., S. Kroll, and J. F. Shogren (2005): "The impact of endowment heterogeneity and origin on public good contributions: evidence from the lab," *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 57(3), 357–365.

Clark, J. (1998): "Fairness in Public Good Provision: An Investigation of Preferences for Equality and Proportionality," *Canadian Journal of Economics*, 31(3), 708–729.

——— (2002): "House Money Effects in Public Good Experiments," *Experimental Economics*, 5(3), 223–231.

Harrison, G. (2007): "House money effects in public good experiments: Comment," *Experimental Economics*, 10(4), 429–437.

Jacquemet, N., R.-V. Joule, S. Luchini, and J. Shogren (2008a): "Do French Students Really Bid Sincerely?," *Working Paper*.

——— (2008b): "Oath-as-Commitment Device in Demand Revelation," *Working paper*.

Kagel, J. (1995): "Auctions: A Survey of Experimental Research," in *Handbook of Experimental Economics*, ed. by J. Kagel, and A. Roth, pp. 501–585. Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Rutström, E. E., and M. B. Williams (2000): "Entitlements and fairness: an experimental study of distributive preferences," *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 43(1), 75–89.

Thaler, R. H., and E. J. Johnson (1990): "Gambling with the House Money and Trying to Break Even: The Effects of Prior Outcomes on Risky Choice," *Management Science*, 36(6), 643–660.

Vickrey, W. (1961): "Counterspeculation, Auctions, and Competitive Sealed Tenders," *Journal of Finance*, 16(1), 8–37.

Zeiliger, R. (2000): "A presentation of Regate, Internet based Software for Experimental Economics," *http://www.gate.cnrs.fr/ zeiliger/regate/RegateIntro.ppt, GATE*.

A Supplementary material: Quiz questions

The four possible answers apppear just after the question. The wright answer is the first one in the list. In the experiment, the answers order is identical within sessions but randomized between sessions.

1. In what place did the delegates of the "Tiers-Etat" met, after the kind rejected the grievance books?

   The "salle du jeu de Paume", The National Assembly, In Versailles, The Senate

2. What is the name of the current Director of the International Monetary Fund?

   Dominique Strauss-Kahn, Alan Greenspan, Alain Juppé, Pascal Lamy

3. Who wrote "Germinal" ?

   Emile Zola, Gustave Flaubert, Guy de Maupassant, Honoré de Balzac

4. What is the capital of Australia?

   Canberra, Sydney, Perth, Auckland

5. Who is the writer who said "l'enfer c'est les autres."

   Jean paul Sartre, Gérard de Nerval, Boris Vian, Sacha Guitry

6. In France, in case of vacancy or impeachment, who decides in place of the President?

   The President of the Senate, The Prime Minister, The President of the national Assembly, The minister of justice Le Garde des Sceaux

7. What is the american state with the largest population?

   Californie, Floride, New York, Texas

8. In the novel "Travel over several far countries in the world", Gulliver discovers fantastique countries. What is the specificity of people from Lilliput ?

   There height is no more than six inches, All are giants, Their head is the one of an animal, They are hugely rich

9. Who wrote "L'Iliade et l'Odyssée" ?

   Homère, Socrate, Platon, Virgile

10. The date at which State and Church were separated is:

    A law from 1905, Au Concordat de 1801, A law from 1889, To the Latran agreement in 1929

11. In chemistry, what are the letters used to symbolize the acidity of a liquid?

    Ph, Na, Ca, Ba

12. Among the following writters, who would have been able to meet Jean-Jacques Rousseau ?

    Voltaire, Baudelaire, Hugo, Zola

13. It designates a word or sentence that says the same thing as what was said before. It is:

    A pleonasm, An euphemism, A metaphor, An understatement

14. Before getting settled in Paris in 1944, the temporary government of the French Republic was:

    In Alger, In Londres, In the free zone, In teh occupied zone

15. Who was the first women to become prime minister (1991-1992) under François Mitterrand presidency?

    Edith Cresson, Simon Veil, Martine Aubry, A women has never occupied this position

16. Signed on 25 mars 1957, this treaty is the starting point of the European Economic Community (CEE):

    The Rome treaty, the Versailles treaty, The Paris treaty, The Maastricht treaty

17. The human body's constitution is...

    60% of water, 20% of water, 40% of water, 80% of water

18. What is the new regulation introduced by the Schengen agreement?

    the free circulation of people, The European flag, The implementation of the Euro, The european constitution project

19. In English, what is the meaning of "Bless you !"

    [A vos souhaits] !, Sorry !, Good bye !, Thank you !

20. Who wrote: "Les sanglots longs ; Des violons de l'automne ; Blessent mon coeur ; D'une langueur monotone"?

    Verlaine, Baudelaire, Musset, Rimbaud

B Supplementary material: Experimental instructions

B.1 Instructions

[*The instructions reported below are used for the Baseline treatment with earned money. The changes implemented according to the treatment appears in brackets.*]

You're involved in an experiment in which you can earn money. The amount you will earn will depend on your own decisions as well as the decisions of other participants.

Before starting the experiment, we will ask you to answer a few questions aimed at knowing you better (your age, your gender, your work occupation, ...). **All those informations as well as your monetary earnings will be kept anonymous and confidential**.

[*Computerized Administrative questionnaire answered at this point*]

Thank you.

Experiment proceedings

[*The text below is used only in earned money sessions. In Windfall sessions, all informations are provided after the instructions for the quiz.*]

The experiment involves two parts. The instructions describing the proceedings of each part will be distributed and read aloud before each one.

How will you take your decisions?

Your screen is divided into three areas:

In the upper part are displayed all the information you need to take your decisions.

The middle part allows you to take your decisions, by pressing on the displayed buttons.

The bottom part reminds you with your past decisions and profits..

Payment of your earnings

Your earnings during the experiment will be expressed in ECU (for *Experimental Currency Unit*). Those earnings are converted into Euros according to the rate: 3 ECU = 1 €. A fixed fee equal to 10€ is added to this payoff. You will be paid privately the corresponding monetary payoff in cash at the end of the experiment.

For obvious scientific reasons, **it is mandatory not to speak during the experiment**. Unfortunately, we will have to ask any participant not complying with this rule to leave the rule without any opportunity to take potential earnings.

It is very important you understand the proceedings of the experiment. If you have any question, please raise your hand, someone will come answering you. Thank you for following this rules.

Thank you for your participation.

[Earned money*: the text below appears only in Earned money sessions. In winfall sessions, the proceedings of the second part appear here.*]

****

Proceedings for the first part

The first part involves **20 rounds**. At each round, you have to answer a question by choosing one out of **four possible answers**. To choose an answer, click on the corresponding button. Only one out of the four answers is correct.

- If the answer you choose is the correct one, your earning for this round is 2 ECU.
- If the answer you choose is not the correct one, your earning for this round is 0 ECU.

At the end of this part, a message displays your earnings in each round. Your payoff in ECU for the first part is the sum over ECU you earned in each period. Press OK once you've read those informations.

****

Proceedings for the second part

At the beginning of this part, **two groups involving 9 participants** are made. **Each participant belongs to the same group during the whole part**.

Overview. You will be participating in an auction in which you are buyer. Your have to offer, at each period, a price in ECU to buy a good. The experiment monitor will re-acquire this good from you. There will be several rounds of bidding. **The outcome of each auction in each round has no influence on [Monetary incentives: *directly influences*] how much you will get paid at the end of the experiment.**

Each round proceeding

Each round has 8 steps.

Step 1. Each bidder looks at his or her **resale value** on his or her screen. We label **resale value** the price in ECU the monitor will pay to buy back a unit of the good that is purchased in the auction. **The resale values of different participants in a group can be different**. Once you looked at your resale value, press the OK button;

Step 2. Each bidder then submits a bid in ECU to buy one unit of the good. To this matter, move the scroll bar until you see the price you want to submit. Then press the OK button below the scroll bar to confirm your choice;

Step 3. The monitor ranks the bids from highest to lowest. In case of ties, the ranking is drawn randomly. For instance:

n° 1 fs.l ECU **Highest bid**

n° 2 df.g ECU

n° 3 za.f ECU

n° 4 qs.a ECU

n° 5 qs.a ECU

n° 6 nj.h ECU

n° 7 hh.m ECU

n° 8 ht.t ECU

n° 9 ky.l ECU **Lowest bid**

Step 4. The second highest bid (bid n°2) determines the **market price**. In the above example, the second highest bid is df.g ECU then the market price would be et df.g ECU:

n° 1 fs.l ECU

---

n° 2 df.g ECU **Second highest bid: market price**

---

n° 3 za.f ECU

n° 4 qs.a ECU

n° 5 qs.a ECU

n° 6 nj.h ECU

n° 7 hh.m ECU

n° 8 ht.t ECU

n° 9 ky.l ECU

Step 5. The buyer who bid the highest price (the buyer ranked n°1) purchases one unit of the good at the market price. In the above example the buyer who bid fs.l ECU purchases one unit of the good that costs df.g ECU.

Step 6. Buyer n°1 then sells the unit back to the monitor. The price of this transaction is the resale value listed for that round on his/her screen. The profit in ECU the bidder n°1 earns for that round is the difference between the resale value and the market price:

$$\text{profit} = \text{Resale value - market price}$$

Important remark. You can have negative profits: if you buy a unit of the good and the resale value is less than the market price, your profits will be negative.

Step 7. All bidders at or below the market price (buyers n°2 to n°9) do not buy anything, **they make zero profit for that round**.

Step 8. End of the round. You profit in ECU in that round appears on your screen. Press the OK button once you read it. On your screen appears whether: a new round is about to start; or the experiment is over.

Earnings for the second part

Your payoff in ECU for this part is set equal to 0 whatever your earnings at each period. [Monetary incentives: *your payoff in* ECU *for this part is set equal to the sum of your earnings at each period.*]

B.2 Pre-experiment questionnaire

1. Groups are rematched in each round.

   ☐ YES ☐ NO

2. Each group involves _____ participants.

3. At the beginning of each round, all participants belonging to my group are attributed the same resale value.

   ☐ YES ☐ NO

4. When I make a bid, I can bid any amount I wish.

   ☐ YES ☐ NO

5. The market price is set by the bid of the highest bidder in my group.

   ☐ YES ☐ NO

6. If my bid is the highest bid and is equal to RR.U ECU and the second highest bid in my group is GG.K ECU, then I buy the unit of the good.

   ☐ YES ☐ NO

   If yes, I pay: _____ for the good.

7. If I purchase a unit of the good and my resale value is greater than the market price, I will make positive profits.

   ☐ YES ☐ NO

8. The monetary payoff I will be paid at the end of the experiment depends on the amount of ECU I earned in the auction.

   ☐ YES ☐ NO

If you are surprised by some answers, please ask questions.